

In the above referenced Office Action, the examiner rejected claims 1-41 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kou (5,874,928) in view of Zenda (4,980,678) in view of Zenda (5,559,525). These rejections have been traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

1. Claims 1, 24 and 33 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) in view of Kou (5,874,928). The examiner states that Kou teaches a “method and apparatus for driving a plurality of displays simultaneously” as claimed by the present invention. Claims 1, 24 and 33 have been amended to include a “coupling controller”. The coupling controller is unique to the present invention and is not taught by the prior art cited.

The coupling controller taught by the present invention receives display preferences, determines whether the display preferences can be fulfilled in observance of the configuration properties of the displays and the computing system and provides configuration requirements to the coupling module (pg. 3, lines 22-31 and pg. 4, lines 1-5). The coupling controller effectively closes “switches” such that the desired display controller is coupled to one or more of the displays. In addition, the coupling controller closes one or more “switches” such that one or more of the display controllers is coupled to retrieve data from the screen memory (pg. 6, lines 6-10). As taught, the coupling controller facilitates a multitude of combinations of displays, display controllers, and screen memories. The screen memory includes a plurality of sections. As such, one screen memory section may store display data for a television, another screen memory may store display data for a CRT display, and yet another may store data for an LCD display (pg. 8, lines 16-21).

In contrast, Kou teaches a method and apparatus for driving a plurality of displays simultaneously, but does not suggest the use of a coupling controller to facilitate the process. Kou teaches a mechanism which enables the use of the same graphics data stream (the data stream from the video buffer) to run two separate displays, and yet refresh each

display using an independent clock rate (pg. 4, lines 13-18). Kou teaches using one display controller and one set of graphics data to drive multiple displays. Kou manipulates the graphics data for a desired display and sets clock rates that will optimize the refresh rate for each display. Kou does not teach the use of multiple display controllers and multiple screen memories, which are configured under the control of a coupling controller. As an example, Kou is limited to driving multiple displays that are displaying the same data.

Clearly, the teaching of Kou does not teach or suggest an invention as presently claimed. As such, the applicant believes that claims 1, 24 and 33 are not obvious in view of the prior art cited and are in condition for allowance.

2. Claims 2-13 are dependent upon Claim 1, which has been shown to be allowable. Since each of claims 2-13 introduces additional patent subject matter, the applicant believes that claims 2-13 are in condition for allowance.

3. Claims 25-32 are dependent upon Claim 24, which has been shown to be allowable. Since each of claims 25-32 introduces additional patent subject matter, the applicant believes that claim 25-32 are in condition for allowance.

4. Claims 34-41 are dependent upon Claim 33, which has been shown to be allowable. Since each of claims 34-41 introduces additional patent subject matter, the applicant believes that claim 34-41 are in condition for allowance.

5. Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kou in view of Zenda (5,559,525). The examiner states that Zenda teaches circuit figure 3A corresponds to video graphics processing circuit claimed by the present invention.

Claim 14, as amended, requires that the plurality of display controllers is included on a single video graphics card. Zenda teaches a first display controller 87 is incorporated in the main body of the portable computer (col. 7, lines 44-45) and a second display controller 109 contained on the LCD display board which is inserted into an expansion slot (col. 8, lines 60-65 and col. 9, lines 8-10). Clearly, the display controllers taught by Zenda are not included on a single video graphics card as required by the present invention (pg. 7, lines 15-18).

6. Claims 15-23 are dependent upon Claim 14, which has been shown to be allowable. Since each of claims 15-23 introduces additional patent subject matter, the applicant believes that claim 15-23 are in condition for allowance.

7. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present patent application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:



Timothy W. Markison
Registration No. 33,534
Phone: (512) 343-1103
Fax No. (512) 372-3990